



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

basic the statement of the Declaration of Independence that the object of just government is to maintain the equal and inalienable rights of life, liberty and property. They avoided in advance the fatal errors of the theorists of the French Revolution and of the more cruel, blind and selfish theorists, the leaders of the Bolshevik Revolution. They were resolved that the people should be as carefully guarded against the despotic will of a majority as against the despotic will of an English king. They framed a Government of justice, not one of power. And the Constitution still deserves the reverence it received during its first century.

Having sketched the origin and distinctive features of our constitutional government, Mr. Taft briefly shows that certain proposed or accepted changes, such as "parliamentary government," the initiative, referendum and recall, the direct primary, and the abolition of party rule are contrary to the principles of the Constitution and offer no benefit. He argues that the direct primary is detrimental to the best public service, in giving a great advantage to the rich candidate.

The tendency toward class legislation and class action in politics is a grave danger.

"With the native born, as well as with the foreign born," says the Chief Justice, "we must inculcate Americanism in its true sense. The greatness of our country, the freedom it secures its citizens, the equality of opportunity evident in the success of the humblest born and in the leadership of the self-made, must all be enforced as a basis of grateful love of country. But more than all it should be pressed into the mind and soul of every boy and girl, that they are the country, and that as they shall pursue an honest, intelligent, industrious, moral life they will be making for a greater America."

It is by such patriotic service as this by Mr. Taft, that the people can be made to understand the inestimable value of their inheritance and the danger of losing it, if they do not bestir themselves to protect it.

EDGAR A. BANCROFT

---

AUSTRALIA AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. By A. D. Ellis. Melbourne, Australia: The Macmillan Co. 1922. pp. 62.

This workmanlike and suggestive little handbook does not pretend to be more than an introduction to a subject not only offering new duties and opportunities to the world in general but involving also very special problems for that strange being, the British Empire.

A number of Dominions, whose status and relations within a great political union no document explains, are equal members by definite treaty in an almost world-wide League of Nations. They have many but not all the attributes of nationhood as generally conceived. They have a complete control of their domestic concerns, but of their part in foreign affairs it is impossible to make an acceptable statement. They, at all events, have not been able to agree upon any. Yet before the British Empire can explain itself to itself it sits at the councils of the world at large in one room as an Empire, in another as so many nations. If its neighbors are inquisitive they will discover that the British Empire is one thing, the unit calling itself the British Empire is apparently another. What other? Great Britain has no seat as such in either the Council or the assembly of the League, yet she certainly sends delegates to both bodies. Newfoundland has no seat as such, yet it seems that she is represented by the delegates from Great Britain. It is also possible for any of the British Dominions to be elected to the Council and to sit side by side with the body calling itself the British Empire. Would the part be

then sitting beside the whole, and would it possibly be voting against the whole? Or does the phrase "the British Empire" mean for the League of Nations only Great Britain and those portions of the Empire not otherwise represented in the League? But if our inquisitive neighbor goes farther he will find Mr. Lloyd George saying that while the instrument for the foreign policy of the Empire is the British Government with its foreign office, that Government and that office are now acting upon the general decisions arrived at with the common consent of the whole Empire. If so, does the British Empire speak in the League with one united voice through the delegates from Great Britain, but with several possibly discordant voices through the various Dominions?

Similar problems caused some searchings of heart in connection with the Washington Conference. Presumably acting upon the statement of Mr. Lloyd George above referred to, President Harding addressed his invitation to Great Britain. It was Great Britain that accepted, but it was more than Great Britain that attended. Canada, Australia, New Zealand and India were directly represented on the British delegation, while South Africa apparently asked that Mr. Balfour speak and sign for her. But while General Smuts takes the view that South Africa attended the Conference, by proxy, in her own right and standing on her own legs, Australia and New Zealand have expressly declared that they were represented not in their own right or as separate entities but as parts of an undivided Empire having but one voice and vote.

The situation is not made any clearer by the fact that while certain mandates have been given to the British Empire acting by Great Britain, others have been given to Australia and South Africa. His Britannic Majesty on behalf of the Government of Australia is directly responsible to the League for the administration of German New Guinea and certain other islands in the Pacific. Another mandate, given to "the British Empire" is administered jointly by Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, Australia supplying the administrator for the first five years.

Dr. Ellis, of course, can only hint at these various difficulties and leave their elaboration to others. His business is descriptive. He sets forth the recent changes in Dominion status leading up to the inclusion of the Dominions in the League. He then outlines the Covenant after showing its relation to past attempts to secure world peace. In this connection we note that in making the usual apology for the Holy Alliance he makes also the usual failure to mention its larger and elder brother, the Grand Alliance, which for seven years prosaically but quite definitely maintained peace in Europe at a time quite as troubled as the present, and which deserves some sort of recognition. Dr. Ellis writes in the straightforward personal style with which Sir John Seeley was wont to beguile us; and is to be congratulated upon a pamphlet as interesting as it is useful.

WARWICK CHIPMAN

---

THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE. By Raymond Leslie Buell. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1922. pp. xiii, 461.

This book, in the reviewer's judgment, would have been twice as good if it were half as long. The text would have matched the title in that case. If the present text were printed under the caption, "What Japan Did to the Washington Conference," the reader would have at a glance the attitude taken by the author, who is one of the most promising of the younger publicists who pay attention to facts and aim to appeal to the general public.